

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 93 19:30:06 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1525
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Thu, 30 Dec 93 Volume 93 : Issue 1525

Today's Topics:

 CW WAIVERS (2 msgs)
 Info sought on KLM Echo-70 432 ssb rig (2 msgs)
 Novice
 QSLROUTE ftp address?
 VK2 Council meeting, 17 Dec 93
 Who Makes Wideband RF Modules??

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 1993 20:48:53 GMT
From: qualcomm.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW WAIVERS
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <joe.1107669716A@ra.nrl.navy.mil> joe@jackal.nrl.navy.mil (joe gregor)
writes:

>There you have it 3 against 4 for code being an important part of ham radio.
>
>I believe important parts should be requirements. I realize that in America
>today everything is right given at birth but I believe that no
>accomplishment has meaning if it did not require EFFORT. Ham radio has grown
>in NUMBERS as a
>result of the no code license but how about QUALITY ?

Mostly, I agree. Morse code is an important part of ham radio, but it isn't *the* most important part of it. That is why I feel the current code tests are obsolete. I support the idea of making it part of the written test. Say, the first ten questions. (Maybe even add more regulations and theory, too, if you are a supporter of increased theory tests.) Then, it would be as much of a requirement as any of the other modes. Also, not passing all the code questions would not disqualify you automatically like it does now.

The specifics need to be worked out, but I think we have the start of a good plan. Now, we must decide how to do it, and what we want to include. To keep with the ITU treaty, maybe we would need to continue to keep a separate 5wpm (or comparably slow speed) test, but drop it when the treaty changes. This would keep us from breaking the treaty anymore than we are now (*sending* is also required in the treaty), and cut down on objections.

Anything else we need? I'd be interested in more (civil) input...

73, Will

--

Will Turner, NØRDV -----
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 1993 23:10:28 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW WAIVERS
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <joe.1107669716A@ra.nrl.navy.mil> joe@jackal.nrl.navy.mil (joe gregor) writes:
>>[somebody wrote]
>>I recognize it as a nearly obsolete mode that is primarily still alive
>>for sentimental reasons.
>>
>I have given this a great deal of thought and have formed the following
>opinion.
>
>The original purpose of Ham Radio was to provide a cadre of experienced
>radio operators to be available in times of local and/or national emergencies.
>I can envision times and situations where some crude form of code (morse)
>would be the only mode available. For this reason alone code should be a
>requirement.

I can envision times when being able to do open heart surgery might be vital too, but the AMA doesn't require every doctor to pass a practical

test in heart surgery. In any *plausible* local emergency, FM voice will be the primary respondent, as it has been for quite some time now. Short of nuclear war, there's unlikely to be a *national* emergency requiring amateur aid. Check your supplies down in the fallout shelter. :-)

>Another purpose was to promote innovation and experimentation. To forever >write off any idea (or mode of operation) is to lose a thread that may >someday lead to greater things.

Morse has had 146 years to be innovative. By that argument, we should require auto manufacturers to put buggy whip holders on all their cars. You never know when it might be innovative to hitch a pair of mules to the old heap. :-)

Note, I'm not saying Morse is worthless. It makes a fine repeater IDer, and knowing Morse can be *convenient* in that you don't have to write down the dits and dahs and look them up in a chart to see who that odd signal you just heard belongs to. But it's unlikely that Morse itself will lead to further innovation.

>Third is enjoyment. I don't know if enjoyment is can really be considered a >purpose but it certainly is a reason. You shouldn't force someone to enjoy a >certain thing simply because you do, however. One against the code requirement.

Yep. Nothing wrong with enjoyment, but it's not a valid reason for a *requirement*.

>A fourth reason, though not one you here about very much today, is to preserve >the history of radio. In this morse code most definitely has a place.

Historic preservation is not a basis or purpose of the amateur service. The Army doesn't require it's infantrymen to qualify with the Brown Bess before being issued M16s just because the old musket has historic ties to the military.

>There you have it 3 against 4 for code being an important part of ham radio.

Looks like 4 to zip against it being a requirement to me.

>I believe important parts should be requirements. I realize that in America >today everything is right given at birth but I believe that no >accomplishment has meaning if it did not require EFFORT. Ham radio has grown >in NUMBERS as a >result of the no code license but how about QUALITY ?

Well an amateur license is a permit to enter a lifelong LEARNING process. We don't expect you to translate the Latin Bible into the vulgate before allowing you into the language lab. But we do expect you to know enough

not to strangle yourself with the headset cord. We don't expect you to have three Nobel Prizes in astrophysics before we let you look through a telescope. But we do expect you to know enough not to shine a flashlight in other people's eyes. Aside from demonstrating you know how to avoid sticking yourself in the eye with the sharp end of the rubber ducky, electrocuting yourself or others, or interfering with critical safety services, entrance into the amateur radio learning environment should be as open as possible. Tests are otherwise irrelevant. It's hoped that you'll expend EFFORT all your life in learning new things by *doing* new things (including learning and working CW if that strikes your fancy). That's the only relevant test, the one you pass or fail every day of your life. If you sit on the bottom end of 20 working CW the rest of your life, you've failed regardless of what government tests you may have passed.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 30 Dec 1993 22:36:12 GMT

From: europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!
col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!icon.rose.hp.com!hpchase.rose.hp.com!
stan@library.ucla.edu
Subject: Info sought on KLM Echo-70 432 ssb rig
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Does anyone know much about the above rig. A local ham has one for \$150.
Physically it's in great shape but I don't know how good a radio it is.
It appears to cover 432.0 to 432.5 and 435.0 to 435.5 from examining the
dial. Is it useable for satellite and dometic work? Does it drift much?

stan

--

- Stan Witherspoon N6SCE - Disclaimer -
- Systems Technology Div. of Hewlett Packard - These are my personal opinions -
- 8010 Foothills Blvd. - and do not represent the views -
- Roseville Ca. 95678 (916) 785-5071 - of anyone or anything else. -
- Email: ucbvax!hplabs!hprpcd!stan or stan@hprpcd.rose.hp.com -

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 1993 23:49:06 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Info sought on KLM Echo-70 432 ssb rig
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2fv14s\$qe0@hpchase.rose.hp.com> stan@hprstw.rose.hp.com (Stan Witherspoon) writes:

>Does anyone know much about the above rig. A local ham has one for \$150.
>Physically it's in great shape but I don't know how good a radio it is.
>It appears to cover 432.0 to 432.5 and 435.0 to 435.5 from examining the
>dial. Is it useable for satellite and dometic work? Does it drift much?

This is a very old rig, one of the first, if not the first, solid state 70cm SSB rigs. It came out in time for the early amateur satellites. It's not a great radio by today's standards. It does drift, and the front end isn't that good either. Still, at \$150, or less if you can talk him down, it can serve for mode B. I don't think it would be too good for mode J or L, but might be usable with a good preamp.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Fri, 31 Dec 93 00:01:23 GMT
From: swrinde!sgiblab!spool.mu.edu!news.clark.edu!netnews.nwnet.net!serval!
eeecs.wsu.edu!rcormier@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Novice
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hi,

I have some questions that I think some of you could answer, and I would appreciate any help you can give me.

My wife's sister just married somebody from Norway and they are moving there in January. Obviously, it is quite expensive to talk via Ma Bell, and so her family asked me to look into the feasibility of using shortwave to converse. Being an electrical engineer, I am quite fascinated with the idea, however I have no idea how to get started and if it is even workable.

Could someone let me know who feasible this is? I have done some research into the licensing aspects, so I am more interested in the start-up costs, reliability and such.

Pleas feel free to email me at.

rcormier@eecs.wsu.edu

Thanks

Ron Cormier

Ron Cormier
Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering - EE/ME 53
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99163
Phone: (509)-335-6470 - Office
 (509)-334-7647 - Home
rcormier@eecs.wsu.edu

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 1993 19:09
From: library.ucla.edu!news.mic.ucla.edu!MVS.OAC.UCLA.EDU!CSMSCST@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: QSLROUTE ftp address?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Could someone tell me the name or IP address of the German
site from which it is possible to FTP "QSLROUTE" updates.
Thanks.

-- 73 de Chris Thomas, AA6SQ (ex-WA6HTJ) (CSMSCST@MVS.OAC.UCLA.EDU)

Date: 31 Dec 93 02:07:01 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!metro!news.ci.com.au!eram!dave@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: VK2 Council meeting, 17 Dec 93
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2fps9h\$lmh@jericho.mc.com>,
levine@mc.com writes:

| Sounds like the typical ham club meeting here also David,
| so don't be so amazed at the President's actions.

Except that this wasn't an ordinary "club", but a business meeting of
the WIA - Wireless Institute of Australia (NSW Division) - which is part

of Australia's national society...

--
Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU) VK2KFU @ VK2RWI.NSW.AUS.OC PGP 2.3
dave@esi.COM.AU ...munnari!esi.COM.AU!dave available

Date: Fri, 31 Dec 1993 02:50:32 GMT
From: usc!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!csn!yuma!
galen@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Who Makes Wideband RF Modules??
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Maybe I should have said '... besides Motorola.' I have their books,
but who else makes RF amp modules working 10-500 MHz with a few watts
output, and what are their phone numbers for literature?
I got that buildin' bug agin',
Galen, KF0YJ

Date: Fri, 31 Dec 1993 00:03:09 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <horak.757274780@convex.com>, <CIV74H.7LK@stortek.com>, <2fv14d\$1ul@chippewa.pd.tgi.plexus.com>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Ramsey kits not too good?

In article <2fv14d\$1ul@chippewa.pd.tgi.plexus.com> markh@news.plexus.com (Mark Heimermann) writes:

>Along this same lines, I was wondering what does the ham
>community think about Hamtronics Kits. We are considering
>them to build a repeater here.

Phptfffffff!

Their older kits really suck. I hear their newest receivers are
much better, but the transmitters are still spur city unless tuned
very carefully with a spectrum analyzer. And their receive converters,
you don't want to know. You'll be happier, and save money, by converting
a Micor or GE Mastr.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary

Destructive Testing Systems	we break it.	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	Guaranteed!	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244		

Date: 30 Dec 1993 15:52:46 -0800
From: news.tek.com!cascade.ens.tek.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <9312262101.A3254wk@support.com>, <joe.1107669716A@ra.nrl.navy.mil>, <CIV8HH.Izw@news.iastate.edu>
Subject : Re: CW WAIVERS

Hi fellow amateurs and wannabees,

Having followed this discussion concerning morse code for a while I feel it is time to give my two cents worth.

The Communication Act of 1934 is what all amateur as well as commercial radio is based off of throughout the world. It is an international treaty. In it's beginning it stated that the airwaves were free and clear and noone had a right to restrict anyone from listening to whatever they wanted to. Thomas Jefferson would have loved it. Being that we needed to regulate who operated where it was agreed to set aside certain frequencies for certain types/modes/etc. of operation. Certain assumptions were made about certain frequencies that have since been proven wrong. Like 40 meters being a band that you could have amateur radio in one region and shortwave broadcast in another region and they would not interfere. Anyone try to operate 40 meters after sundown and try to compete with Radio Moscow, etc.

It is my understanding that the existance of amateur radio is based on the 1934 treaty. Yes, amateur radio came along before it but any leagle reason for amateur radio to exist is tied to the Communications Act of 1934.

One of the requirement set up was that any amateur radio operator had to demonstreat a proficiency in morse code. It is my understanding that it does not say how fast you have to copy or send. But being an old Army Security Agency fella I know no one really know morse code as a language till they are able to copy it above about 10 words/groups per minute. Flame all you want but having spent a year at Fort Devens, Mass. trying to learn the code with a couple of thousand other soldiers teaches you something about it.

It is my belief that AT&T, Bell, Commercial Broadcasters, Shortwave Broadcaster, etc. would like to do everything they could to get the valuable frequency allocations now assigned to amateur radio. Does anyone want to flame that one. The less united in a common front the amateur radio community is the more likely that we will lose spectrum alocation to other interest.

Have you noticed now how the Congress of the United States has passed legislation making it illegle(sp) to monitor cellular phones. How does that fly in the face of the act of 1934 saying the airwave are free and clear for anyone who wants to to listen to. You can go on and cite how satilite broadcast interest try to get legislation passed to restrict people from monitoring their

broadcast without paying for it. I am sure people in this news group can cite more examples than I can.

The point really is that if you want to change the spectrum allocation of amateur radio you better come to a mutual concensis and not polarize yourselves into procode/nocode groups because the commercial interest have the money to exploit your devision to their advantage. How many times have we heard(sp) it said that there probably won't be any amateur radio by the year

As for me, I really don't operate morse code. I like contesting, DXing, ragchewing with DX stations, and a few other things. I think 2 meters is mostly a bunch of people telling eachother hi/the weather is such and such/bye. But... that is what they like and I don't have to listen to it if I don't want to. I can change the frequency. I might be inclined to say morse code gets too much spectrum allocation and voice or digital modes(Pactor/RTTY/etc.) doesn't. But I would rather the amateur radio community settle there problems within their own community than make such a big deal that the F.C.C. or even Congress gets in and decides for them. Has anyone seen the Federal Government do anything right where money interest were concerned? I haven't.

If you like to operate CW, great. Anyone who thinks you must be some kind of defect had better take a look in the mirror. Same can be said for the other modes of operation. I really find it incredible that normally intelligent hams would say someone is S & M for wanting to operate morse code. Really, get a life! Do you really believe that or are you just trying to be a jerk?

You know, you hear alot of bad operating practices on the airwaves nowdays. I think it is about time we as amateur radio operators started educating some people as to how to show courtesy and promote amateur radio as it is suppose to be. An organization to provide emergency communication when needed and to promote international good will. Also, to teach people about radio and electronics. Not put someone down because they want to work morse code, or DX, or run traffic, or whatever. I sure do miss the way hams used to talk about their stations back in the 60's. You used to be able to learn alot by just listening. I know, I didn't get my license till 1977 but I listened as far back as 1964 or so.

Well, go ahead and flame away. You got the right. It is called Freedom of Speech. But think a minute about how it would be nice to hear something more positive and constructive concerning how to improve amateur radio. Also, for amateur radio to have a viable future it needs to be able to try new modes and schemes and such.

...For what it is worth, my two cents worth...

KI7M

Terry Burge

Date: 30 Dec 1993 16:35:57 -0600

From: destroyer!news.cic.net!news.plexus.com!news.plexus.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec30.155838.21384@rchland.ibm.com>, <horak.757274780@convex.com>, <CIV74H.7LK@stortek.com>-m
Subject : Re: Ramsey kits not too good?

Along this same lines, I was wondering what does the ham community think about Hamtronics Kits. We are considering them to build a repeater here.

73 de kf9cs...appleton,wi...

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 1993 21:31:02 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <msanders-281293150945@msanders.sim.es.com>, <1993Dec29.131133.17917@hemlock.cray.com>, <1993Dec30.090602.1@matrix.cs.wright.edu>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: UK scanner & Cops

In article <1993Dec30.090602.1@matrix.cs.wright.edu> isoper@matrix.cs.wright.edu writes:

>> Well I have recently heard news accounts where federal agents sent announcements
>> in the mail to the last known addresses of a list of criminals saying,
>> "Congradulations, you are the lucky winner in our drawing..." A whole swarm
>> of these guys showed up, produced ID, and were immediately handcuffed.
>>
>> There is something in all this that really bothers me about a system that
>> would allow it's police force, those we hire to enforce laws dealing with
>> honesty, to lie, to commit fraud, to do what ever beyond the law, in order
>> to catch criminals, or even to pursuade people to commit a crime so that
>> they can be arrested.
>>
>> --David C. Adams
>
>escape from justice). 4. No crime was committed by the law enforcement officers
>operating the sting as they did not force a person by use of physical threat
>to show up at the sting (the criminals made decision to be greedy, ie: obtain
>a product either by chance or pick it up in person for personal gain rather
>than coercion).

I disagree. Unless the police actually awarded prizes, they were

commiting mail fraud. As long as they awarded the prizes, I don't have a problem with them arresting the fugitives. What I have a problem with is the police committing crimes they would arrest you or me for in the name of law enforcement.

It's illegal to sell drugs, but police do it. It's illegal to buy stolen goods, but police do it. It's illegal to speed, but police do it without the required emergency signals. It's illegal to serve a warrant for a technical tax violation with concussion grenades, but the BATF did it. It's illegal to murder a woman standing in the doorway of her home holding her baby, but the FBI HRT did it.

We hire police to uphold the law, not break it. But many police use all manner of excuses to justify being above the law. Saying the ends justify the means just doesn't wash any more than "only following orders" is a legitimate defense for atrocity. Failure to obey the law makes the police just another armed gang. That they're nominally "our" gang shouldn't make any difference.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 1993 23:28:51 GMT
From: swrindle!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <CIsypt.BJ0.2@cs.cmu.edu>, <CIt4z4.CA4@world.std.com>, <1993Dec30.183810.9862@newshost.pictel.com>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Repeater database?

In article <1993Dec30.183810.9862@newshost.pictel.com> wpns@newshost.pictel.com (Willie Smith) writes:

>dts@world.std.com (Daniel T Senie) writes:

>>The repeater directory does NOT list evrey frequency in use. Many frequencies
>>are used for other purposes than repeaters, yet are sensitive to interference.
>>When you pick a simplex frequency, please keep this in mind!

>

>Wait a minute! You're saying that the co-ordination data isn't
>readily available, but be careful about picking simplex frequencies?
>Should I check with my local co-ordination body each time I select a
>simplex frequency? Sure would drop the occupied bandwidth, last time

>I tried to contact the co-ordinators to figure out where to put a
>dedicated packet link they all gave me the NIMBY (Not In My Band ...)
>response. Of course, they took the better part of a year to even
>respond...

It can get ugly can't it? Still, there are recognized bandplans. Operating casual simplex in the link subband is anti-social even though it's not illegal. And putting a link in the recognized simplex operating segment is nothing short of stupid, not to mention being impolite. I had a battle with a group who had put their two meter split site link on the *input* frequency of my 440 repeater. Now that was both anti-social and dumb to put a link in the middle of a repeater input segment of a band. We don't even want to talk about crossbanded rigs popping up everywhere without timeout timers, IDers, or any other sense of legality.

Coordinating bodies have had a hard time figuring out what to do about packet. It's mainly simplex users, so not their problem, yet it also needs coordinated nodes and links, so it is their problem. What many of the traditional coordinating bodies have done is put on their bandplanning hats and set aside a block of spectrum for packet and turned over the responsibility for coordinating it to a packet group. That's worked fairly well so far.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1525
